

ADAMS, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

) CASE NO. 1:16CR134

Plaintiff,

3

v.

2
)

BRANDON HEARD.

ORDER

Defendant

1

Pending before the Court is Defendant's motion for compassionate release. Doc. 79.

Upon review, the motion is DENIED.

Within the COVID-19 backdrop, the Sixth Circuit explained this Court’s duties and obligations when considering a motion for compassionate release as follows:

“In resolving those motions, district courts now face two questions: (1) whether extraordinary and compelling circumstances merit a sentence reduction; and (2) whether the applicable § 3553(a) factors warrant such a reduction. A third consideration, the § 1B1.13 policy statement, is no longer a requirement courts must address in ruling on defendant-filed motions.” *Hampton*, 985 F.3d at 531. To that end, district courts need not confine themselves to evaluating “extraordinary and compelling reasons” as defined by the Sentencing Commission in the § 1B1.13 policy statement. *Elias*, 984 F.3d at 519.

United States v. Montero, 842 F. App’x 1007, 1008 (6th Cir. 2021). “A district court has ‘full discretion’ in determining whether an extraordinary and compelling reason justifies compassionate release.” *Id.* at 1009.

Williams has failed to demonstrate any extraordinary and compelling circumstances to warrant his release. Initially, the Court notes that the COVID pandemic has ended and the BOP

has demonstrated a firm grasp on managing any new infections. More importantly, Williams has identified no medical ailments that place him at a higher risk of severe illness if he were to be infected. Accordingly, the motion for compassionate release is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

October 3, 2023

Date

/s/John R. Adams

JOHN R. ADAMS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE